

From: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#)
Subject: RE: Chapter 5 and 11 Review
Date: 12/18/2007 10:18 AM

Eric,
Mon 1/14, Tues/15 & Fri 1/18 look open for me

James M. Anderson
DEQ Northwest Region
Portland Harbor Section
Phone (503) 229-6825
Fax (503) 229-6899

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2007 3:59 PM
To: Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov
Cc: ANDERSON Jim M; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; MCCLINCY Matt
Subject: Re: Chapter 5 and 11 Review

Because of the short time-frames involved, I think it is pretty much a done deal that our review of Chapter 5 will be necessarily general. I will try to come up with some additional thoughts for your consideration about what we should focus on. That said, I would like us to make a concerted effort regarding Section 11. This really will set the stage about how upland sources will be addressed in the draft RI and ultimately the FS and ROD. I think that taking a few days sometime in January to develop a common understanding of the sources and pathways of contamination that are impacting the river will yield great benefits. Perhaps we could target the week of January 17th for this.

Let me know if this would be a good week and stay tuned.

Thanks, Eric

Kristine
Koch/R10/USEPA/U
S
12/13/2007 12:58
PM

To
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us,
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
MCCLINCY Matt
<MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>
Subject
Re: Chapter 5 and 11 Review
(Document link: Eric Blischke)

Eric - See responses below.

Kristine Koch
Remedial Project Manager
USEPA, Office of Environmental Cleanup

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900, M/S ECL-115
Seattle, Washington 98101-3140

(206)553-6705
(206)553-0124 (fax)
1-800-424-4372 extension 6705 (M-F, 8-4 Pacific Time, only)

Eric
Blischke/R10/USE
PA/US
12/13/2007 12:12
PM

To
Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
cc
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us,
MCCLINCY Matt
<MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>
Subject
Chapter 5 and 11 Review

Kristine, I guess you were not able to find a phone. Chip and I did have a short conversation with DEQ. We left it that you would coordinate with DEQ for any assistance on Chapter 5. In the mean time, I am forwarding your review plans on Section 5 and 11 to DEQ for them to look at. I am also attaching a word version of DEQ's comments on Chapter 5.

As outlined in your review plan, the goal of the Chapter 5 review is to (paraphrasing):

Ensure that all pathways have been identified
Confirm that the source information is accurate and complete Determine whether the discussion of current and historical sources are adequate
Confirm that all potential future sources are properly identified.

My questions regarding section 5 are:

What level of support is needed for this review? If DEQ needs to be doing something, we need to identify it now. DEQ has already reviewed and commented on Section 11. I was going to use those comments in my review and then have a discussion with DEQ on my comments to see if I missed something. DEQ may want to look at this section, especially Table 5.1.2 to see if they agree with LWGs determination of pathway characterization at each of the 79 sites. I've almost completed review of the text, but the tables are going to take some time to review - especially if I don't have the background documents to consider. That's probably where I have to engage DEQ. Jim/Matt - we may want to discuss this further next week or have a conf call (maybe tomorrow or early next week) when I have a phone (urgh!).

What is the relationship between Section 5 and Section 11? My sense is that section 5 is pretty general and that Section 11 is where we should focus our efforts. Section 5 discusses the specific sources that have been identified while Section 11 discusses linkages with those sources and areas that posed unacceptable risk (their term, not mine). Is the information complete and accurate? These are really Kristine's goals outlined above. Are there statements regarding the relative importance of a given source that we fundamentally disagree with?

Please coordinate with DEQ on what is needed and also what support is needed for Chapter 11. Again, DEQ has provided comments that I'll be using as I'm looking at linking of sediment contamination with upland sources. I probably won't be doing a lot of this until January. I would like to have a discussion with DEQ once I've completed the review. This may be the Source Control Summit that you suggested earlier this year depending on the significance of the findings. We should take advantage of all the good work DEQ has put into its earlier review of Chapter 11. Regarding the review itself it is probably the four things that Kristine identified and the last two things I identified (which are really intertwined).

Finally, I would like to keep this review general because of timing considerations and because the real work will take place during our review of Chapter 11. However, we should not lose site of the fact that Chapter 5 really sets the stage for Chapter 11.

Please let me know if you have any questions or we need to discuss next steps further.

Thanks, Eric

[attachment "DEQ Comments on Section 11.doc" deleted by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US] [attachment "Portland Harbor Round 2 Report Review Plan - Section 11 & App J.doc" deleted by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US] [attachment "Portland Harbor Round 2 Report Review Plan - Section 5 & App B.doc" deleted by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US]